

MAR 22 1961

Approved For Release 2004/12/15 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700020038-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

I by no means downgrade the role of industry. We on the Joint Committee want to encourage a growing, healthy, and competitive atomic industry. We don't want it to end up with one or two giants dominating a weakened industrial effort. Nor do we want the work spread so thin that it is impossible to have a nucleus of talent sufficient to do an adequate job. This requires technical and managerial judgment of a high order.

I believe you are aware of one field which the Joint Committee has pioneered. That is an affirmative effort to obtain advice and information from industry itself as well as other groups, including scientists and labor. This has been accomplished through such means as our "202" hearings on the state of the industry through informal seminars and meetings, through panels of consultants, and by individual visits and discussions. All of this is to the good in my opinion. And I am glad to say that in recent years the AEC has followed suit.

AEC ADMINISTRATION

Finally a word on administration and management. For years we on the Joint Committee labored to get mutual agreement with AEC on program objectives and methods. We have made considerable progress in this direction, but something still seems to be missing. It still takes AEC far too long to develop and recommend projects, and still longer to get construction started after authorization. The AEC finally began to recognize this problem of long leadtime more than a year ago. But I regret to say that progress is still too slow.

And now, my friends, we have talked mostly tonight of the technological challenges of the sixties. Behind those frontiers, there looms the grim and threatening challenges of a vigorous and dangerous ideology. Its shadow has already engulfed most of the land mass of the European and Asian continents. Another grim shadow stretches out south of Europe to a land of teeming and restless millions. In another century we were wont to refer to it as the "Dark Continent". In this century—yes, in this decade—we see the darkness of Communism threatening these new colonial nations. A darkness not of pigmentation of the skin, but a growing cloud which seeks to snuff out the lights of the mind—the torches of dignity and freedom.

I trust that we, of this generation, working as we plan to work on the technological challenges of the sixties, will not become so engrossed with our pursuit of the economical kilowatt that we forget the great ideological challenge which looms always behind the technological frontiers of the sixties.

Let us resolve to acquit ourselves so that future historians will write, "They solved the problems of the sixties and they also laid the foundation in the 20th century for the preservation of freedom."

EARL WARREN'S FELLOW TRAVELERS SMEAR JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks Members of this House have been inundated with letters from thoughtful Americans who are clamoring to bring about the impeachment of Earl Warren. This movement has been spearheaded by the John Birch Society, a nationwide organization of patriotic Americans whose dedication to their country

is epitomized in their aim to bring about "less government, more responsibility, and a better world to live in." It is significant that although the John Birch Society is more than 2 years old, it has been almost completely ignored by the press until its recent all-out drive to impeach the Chief Justice. Recently the John Birch Society has been disparaged by Time magazine and by Members of the other Chamber of this Congress. These charges and their poisonous sources will be discussed in detail and their origin disclosed.

The John Birch Society, led by its courageous and perceptive founder, Robert Welch, of Belmont, Mass., has levelled the full force of its attack upon one of the most inept poseurs who has ever worn the robes of Chief Justice. Earl Warren had no judicial experience before he attained the highest judicial office in our Republic. He received this honor as a reward for delivering the votes of the State of California to the late misguided Eisenhower regime. The audacity of the Warren Court has finally aroused a large portion of our lethargic and complacent population. Americans who had taken our freedoms for granted have at last begun to realize that only renewed vigilance will preserve our freedoms in a world that is rapidly being swallowed up by the Communist conspiracy.

Few people who scoffed at southerners and their resistance to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, realized the real significance of the death knell which was sounded for the Constitution of the United States on that fateful day. The issue at stake was not the right of States to run their schools as each State deemed best for its own particular needs. Actually, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court assumed the authority to nullify State boundaries and to make laws by judicial decision.

The issue has been clouded by the arguments of idealistic and social-minded persons. Now, however, humanitarians who once hailed the decision as a broad interpretation of the Constitution are beginning to perceive its frightening implications. They realize now that the decision of May 17, 1954, was a part of a pattern designed to weaken and gradually prostrate our entire governmental structure. A review of the decisions of the Warren court establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt that while the interests of the United States have been grossly abused, the interests of our enemies have been handled most tenderly. The report of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, published in 1953, illustrates this solicitude for the enemy in simple and graphic terms. Since the publication of the report, additional decisions of the Warren court merely aggravate its concern to protect the termites in our midst.

Why should not the John Birch Society attack Earl Warren? That he is unfit to fill his high position is attested to by his own colleagues, whose dissenting opinions show that even his fellow Justices hold no high opinion of their Chief's qualifications for his grave

responsibility. Process rights, explicit in our Constitution, have been snatched from our people by Earl Warren and his cohorts. The list is an appalling one. Many rights, guaranteed by the sovereign States in framing the Constitution, have been taken away from the Federal Government as well as from the States. When the members of the John Birch Society protested this Court's usurpation, as is their right and duty as loyal American citizens, Time magazine, of March 10, carried a slurring account of the society and its founder. It is curious to note the similarity of the article in Time to an article published about a week previous to its appearance, in People's World, a west coast publication. People's World, as verified by the research staff of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, is the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast. In its issue for February 25, 1961, appeared an article describing the John Birch Society. It characterizes the chapters of the society as "cells," and states that the society was named for John Birch, "a U.S. Army captain, who is supposed to have died in China 10 days after V-J Day. Welch blames his death on Chinese Communists." The Communists' organ also states:

On Welch's council are such veteran enemies of democratic rights as Dean Clarence Manford, T. Coleman Andrews, former income tax collector; Spruille Braden, former Latin American "expert" of the U.S. State Department; and Adolphe Menjou, unsavory relic of the House Un-American raid on Hollywood.

It seems strange that Time magazine, with its extensive research department, should have used language and examples so similar to the above description in attacking the John Birch Society. Time's article carried the same three names in listing the council of the John Birch Society. And yet there are 27 members of the council of the John Birch Society, all of whom are unquestionably patriotic. Why did not Time magazine see fit to name additional members of the council? Is it possible that Time was content with a mere rehash of the article that appeared in a Communist publication? In its effort to smear the society, why did not Time verify the fact that John Birch was an Army captain who served with honor under the command of Gen. Claire Chennault? That John Birch's death was mysteriously hushed up by this Government has been established by painstaking research. Naturally, the Communist Party is anxious to discredit the record of an American hero who was slain by Chinese Communists 10 days after the Communists joined the United States as allies. Why is Time magazine anxious to discredit the organization that bears his name in words so strangely similar to those used by a Communist publication?

It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, when one sees the appalling list of Supreme Court decisions that are crippling our State and National defenses against the Communist conspiracy, that the very organization that is alerting our people to this menace should be attacked by the Communist organ. It is surprising, however, that a magazine like Time, which